

D4  
object type, information type, priority for showing, time stamp, object ID of link-destination object and object ID of a next object, which are able to be modified after being created as an information object; and

code for causing the computer to display the information object on a window in accordance with information contents and attribute information relating to display of objects such that the information object appears different from any non-selected information in the external application program.

### REMARKS

#### INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 17, 21, 25 and 26 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration.

#### EXAMINER INTERVIEW

As a preliminary matter, Examiners Huynh and Hong are thanked for the in-person interview conducted on December 5, 2001. It is noted that the Interview Summary indicated that it is not necessary for the applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1-3, 17-18, 21-22, 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Nakajima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,791) and Khoyi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,421,015). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore are not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 recites "the selected information is created as an information object so as to be shown on the window by said drawing unit such that the information object appears different from any non-selected information in the external application program." Thus, the selected information is easily distinguishable from any non-selected information.

In the above-referenced interview, the Examiners appeared convinced that neither Nakajima et al. nor Khoyi et al. disclose this feature. Nakajima et al. is not relied upon by the Examiner as disclosing this feature. Instead, the Examiner relies upon Nakajima et al. as disclosing obtaining information from the external application program and creating an information object. Khoyi et al. discloses that a plurality of object managers may operate on any given object type. Khoyi et al., col. 3, ln. 22-36. Thus, Khoyi et al. discloses that the means for operating on the object may change, but does not disclose that the final appearance of the selected object appears different from the non-selected information. Thus, different object managers may operate on the information object, but the information object will have the same appearance as non-selected information.

Based upon the above, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2 and 3 depending therefrom is requested.

Independent claims 17, 21, 25 and 26 have been amended to recite similar features. Accordingly, withdrawal of claims 17, 21, 25 and 26 and claims 18 and 22 depending therefrom is requested.

Claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima and Khoyi as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Person. Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima, Khoyi and Person, and further in view of Microsoft.

Claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 and 13-15 depend from claims 1, 17 and 21, which are patentable over Nakajima et al. and Khoyi et al., as discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that neither Person nor Microsoft overcomes the deficiencies of Nakajima et al. and Khoyi et al. It is noted that neither reference is relied upon by the Examiner as disclosing that the information object appears different from any non-selected information in the external application program. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 and 13-15 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining informalities to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such informalities.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY, LLP

Date: 2-1-01

By: Michael J. Badagliacca  
Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

700 Eleventh Street, N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501